

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 26 have been amended. No new matter is submitted and reconsideration of the allowability of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-29 are pending and under consideration, with claims 2, 5-7, 9-11, 15, 18, and 20-29 having been indicated as including allowable subject matter.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-13 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, with the Office Action indicating that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended to emphasize that at least one element is required to be implemented by the claimed at least one processing device. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 26 meet the PTO requirements under 35 USC 101.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 8, 12-14, 16-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., US Patent No. 5,864,805, in view of Crawford, US Patent No. 5,754,176; and claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., in view of Huang et al., US Patent No. 5,829,000, and further in view of Crawford. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

By way of review, and only as an example, independent claim 1 sets forth:

A speech recognition method comprising:
inputting speech uttered by a user;
recognizing the input speech and displaying a list of a predetermined number of alternative words including a first alternative word to be recognized in an order of similarity; and
determining, using at least one processing device, the first alternative word that a cursor currently indicates as a final, recognized word if a user selection has not been changed within a predetermined standby time.

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Office Action indicated that Chen et al. sets forth all the claimed features except for the claimed "determining ... the first alternative word that a cursor currently indicates as a final, recognized word if a user selection has not been changed within a predetermined standby time," which the Office Action relies upon Crawford to disclose, and to provide a rationale for modifying Chen et al.

In particular, the Office Action recites: "Chen et al. fail to specifically disclose the steep of

selecting a word from a list of words that a cursor is currently at if a user selection has not been changed within predetermined standby time. However, Crawford teaches the step of selecting a word from a list of words that a cursor is currently at if a user selection has not been changed within a predetermined standby time (steps 502-506 in figure 5)."

The Office Action states that the reason for modifying Chen et al. would be "to improve speech recognition accuracy."

However, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of Crawford has been misapplied to the system of Chen et al., and in particular does not set forth a reason for selecting a word from available alternative words within a speech recognition environment, and further does not set forth a reason for selecting such a word within the same speech recognition environment if a user has not moved the cursor, for example, within the predetermined period of time.

Rather, Crawford sets forth a graphic user interface (GUI) for a help window, which is a different environment from a displayed listing of selectable alternative words within a speech recognition environment.

The displaying of a help window after a cursor has been stationary over a 'hot zone' for a predetermined delay time, and a removal of the same after a period of time after the cursor is moved away from the hot zone, is done for a particular purpose and based upon a particular understanding of what a user desires within such a help window environment, i.e., that a user only desires to see a help window at particular times, and then only for certain lengths of time after viewing.

Here, in Crawford, if the user does not select an item in the help window and moves the cursor away from the hot zone within the specified time *that means that the user has no interest in the information contained in the help window*. Similarly, if the user has no initial interest in the help window, then the help window will not be shown since the user will not maintain the cursor within the corresponding hot zone for a sufficient length of time.

Conversely, within the speech recognition environment of Chen et al., there is an entirely different purpose for displaying the alternative words, and it is *expected and necessary* that the user selects one of the alternative words or does some positive action to indicate an appropriate alternative word. In the system of Chen et al., there is no expectation that the user would not desire or need to see the shown alternative words, rather, again, it is necessary for the user to view the alternative words. The alternative words will always be shown to the user and are only removed after the user has selected one of the words. Chen et al. requires an action by the user.

In addition, the "reason" relied upon in the Office Action for modifying Chen et al., i.e., "to

improve speech recognition accuracy,” is not the purpose of the window opening or closing of Crawford, and is not a purpose or reason disclosed or suggested by Crawford.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the time based window opening or closing of Crawford to differently operate the speech recognition system of Chen et al. The purpose, i.e., the problem solved, by Crawford would not be present in Chen et al. In fact, purpose of the time based window opening or closing of Crawford is an opposite desired purpose from that of Chen et al., which needs the example window to be maintained open and needs a user to select one of the alternative words.

Again, in the system of Crawford, when a user does not position the cursor at the hot zone for a sufficient amount of time, or moves the cursor away from the hot zone for a sufficient amount of time, that means the user has no interest in anything displayed within the window.

If the underlying rationale of Crawford, for opening or closing the help window, were to be applied to Chen et al., the *actual teaching* would be to *not* perform *any* action upon the non-selection of an alternative word, or not to show the alternative words at all.

With such a modification, the modified Chen et al. would not operate as intended, i.e., an alternative word would never be chosen.

Conversely, the Office Action has set forth a proposed modification of Chen et al., where the user's inaction would actually be a positive action of selecting one of the shown alternative words.

Thus, counter to the suggestion in Crawford that it may be desired to ignore such messages, the Office Action is relying on a *different reason* for modifying Chen et al. than that set forth in Crawford, i.e., the Office Action has used a feature of Crawford for a different purpose and a different reason than actually taught by Crawford.

To modify Chen et al., as suggested in the Office Action, there would have to be a completely different reason, i.e., to purposefully select one of the words if the predetermined time expired, which is only set forth in the present application.

Thus, a combination of Crawford and Chen et al. would not disclose the claimed “determining ... the first alternative word that a cursor currently indicates as a final, recognized word if a user selection has not been changed within a predetermined standby time,” i.e., the modified Chen et al. would not “determine the first alternative word as a final recognized word” if the predetermined standby time expires. Rather, no final alternative word would be selected.

Accordingly, in addition to Crawford being directed toward a different purpose, the combination Chen et al. and Crawford would not set forth the claimed “determining ... the first

alternative word that a cursor currently indicates as a final, recognized word if a user selection has not been changed within a predetermined standby time."

Therefore, it would not have been obvious to modify Chen et al., as suggested in the Office Action, and even if the teaching of Crawford were applied to Chen et al. the combination would be different from the Office Action proposed combination. A combination of Chen et al. and Crawford would be different from the claimed features of independent claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that Huang et al. equally fails to disclose or suggest such deficient features.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 14 and 17 include similar allowable subject matter, with differing scope and breadth.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 14, and 17 are allowable over the cited prior art. It is further respectfully submitted that claims depending from independent claims 1, 14, and 17 are equally allowable based on their respective features and their dependence from allowable base claims. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

7/1/09

By: _____

Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501